

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-32 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-32 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 6, 12, and 23 have been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-32 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-32 are objected to. The recitation "opening" in claims 1, 12, and 23 is objected to as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Herein, claims 1, 12, and 23 have been amended to remove the recitation "opening". Thus, the Claim objections are moot. Claims 2, 13, and 24 have previously been canceled.

35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14, 16-23, 25, and 27-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mamiya et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,764,322 (hereafter Mamiya), in view of Kubo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,456,279 (hereafter Kubo). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites (as amended):

A display assembly for an electronic device comprising:
a backlight device;
a **reflective display** disposed above said backlight device and
comprising a top surface and a bottom surface;

an embedded light guide which is embedded in said reflective display between said top surface and said bottom surface

wherein said embedded light guide is for conducting light from said backlight device to an area in front of said top surface of said reflective display; and
a front light reflecting film disposed in front of said top surface of said reflective display. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that the combination of Mamiya and Kubo does not teach, motivate, or suggest the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitations, "a ***reflective display*** disposed above said backlight device and ***comprising a top surface and a bottom surface***," (emphasis added), and, "***an embedded light guide which is embedded in said reflective display between said top surface and said bottom surface***," (emphasis added). At page 3 of the Office Action, it is admitted that Mamiya does not describe an embedded light guide, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Further, Figure 4 and Col. 8, line 65 through Col. 9, line 20 of Kubo are cited as describing the embedded light guide.

However, Kubo shows a reflection type of liquid crystal panel (1) as a bottom layer, a light guide plate (2) as a middle layer, and a touch panel (4) as a top layer instead of showing an embedded light guide which is embedded in the reflective display between the top surface and the bottom surface of the reflective display. [Kubo; Figure 4, Col. 7, line 54 through Col. 9, line 20]. Hence, Kubo fails to teach, motivate, or suggest an embedded light guide which is embedded in the reflective display between the top surface and the bottom surface of the reflective display, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

Thus, the combination of Mamiya and Kubo does not teach, motivate, or suggest all the limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully

submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Mamiya and Kubo and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 3 and 5-11 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over the combination of Mamiya and Kubo. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 3 and 5-11 are patentable over the combination of Mamiya and Kubo for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 12 and 23, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 12 and 23 recite similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claims 12 recites the limitation, "an ***embedded light guide which is embedded between said top surface and said bottom surface of said reflective display***," (emphasis added). Independent Claims 23 recites the limitation, "a plurality of ***embedded light guides which are embedded between said top surface and said bottom surface of said reflective display***," (emphasis added). As discussed above, the combination of Mamiya and Kubo fails to teach, suggest, or motivate the cited limitations. Therefore, Independent Claims 12 and 23 are allowable over the combination of Mamiya and Kubo for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 14, 16-22 and Dependent Claims 25, 27-32 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 12 and 23, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Mamiya and Kubo. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 14, 16-22, 25, and 27-32 are patentable over the combination of Mamiya and Kubo for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 4, 15, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mamiya et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,764,322 (hereafter Mamiya), in view of Kubo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,456,279 (hereafter Kubo), and in view of Hirakata et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,191,833 (hereafter Hirakata). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claim 4, Dependent Claim 15, and Dependent Claim 26 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1, 12, and 23, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Mamiya and Kubo. Moreover, Hirakata does not teach, motivate, or suggest embedded light guide which is embedded between the top surface and the bottom surface of the reflective display, as in the invention of Independent Claims 1, 12, and 23. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 1, 12, and 23 are patentable over the combination of Mamiya, Kubo, and Hirakata for the reasons discussed above. Since Dependent Claims 4, 15, and 26 depend from Independent Claims 1, 12, and 23, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 4, 15, and 26 are patentable over the combination of Mamiya, Kubo, and Hirakata for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, remarks, and arguments overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-32) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-32) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 2/15/2006

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060